arXiv:1510.08535v1 [cs.IT] 29 Oct 2015

On the Covering Radius of the Second Order Reed-Muller Code of Length 128

Qichun Wang *

Abstract

In 1981, Schatz proved that the covering radius of the binary Reed-Muller code $RM(2,6)$ is 18. For $RM(2,7)$, we only know that its covering radius is between 40 and 44. In this paper, we prove that the covering radius of the binary Reed-Muller code $RM(2,7)$ is at most 42. Moreover, we give a sufficient and necessary condition for Boolean functions of 7-variable to achieve the second-order nonlinearity 42.

Keywords: Reed-Muller codes, covering radius, Boolean functions, second-order nonlinearity.

1 Introduction

In [11], Schatz proved that the covering radius of the binary Reed-Muller code $RM(2,6)$ is 18. For $m \geq 7$, the covering radius of $RM(2,m)$ is still unknown. However, some bounds on it have been given [3, 4, 5]. From these bounds, we know that the covering radius of the binary Reed-Muller code $RM(2,7)$ is between 40 and 44.

In [7], the authors proposed an improved list decoding algorithm. Using that algorithm, they found a 7-variable Boolean function with the second order nonlinearity 38. In [1], the authors studied the covering radius of binary Reed-Muller codes in the set of resilient Boolean functions, and found a 7-variable balanced Boolean function with the second order nonlinearity 40.

In this paper, we prove that the covering radius of the binary Reed-Muller code RM(2,7) is at most 42. Moreover, we give a sufficient and

*Temasek Laboratories, National University of Singapore, 117411, Singapore, Email: tslwq@nus.edu.sg

necessary condition for Boolean functions of 7-variable to achieve the second-order nonlinearity 42.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the necessary background is established. In Section 3, we give some observations which will be used afterwards. We then prove the main theorem in Section 4. We end in Section 5 with conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ be the n-dimensional vector space over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_2$. We denote by B_n the set of all n-variable Boolean functions, from $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ into $\mathbb{F}_2$.

Any Boolean function $f \in B_n$ can be uniquely represented as a multivariate polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_2[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$,

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \sum_{K \subseteq \{1,2,\ldots,n\}} a_K \prod_{k \in K} x_k,$$

which is called its algebraic normal form (ANF). The algebraic degree of f, denoted by $\deg(f)$, is the number of variables in the highest order term with nonzero coefficient.

A Boolean function is *affine* if there exists no term of degree strictly greater than 1 in the ANF. The set of all affine functions is denoted by A_n.

The cardinality of the set $\{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n | f(x) = 1\}$ is called the *Hamming weight* of f. The *Hamming distance* between two functions f and g is the Hamming weight of $f + g$, and will be denoted by $d(f, g)$.

Let $f \in B_n$. The *nonlinearity* of f is its distance from the set of all n-variable affine functions, that is,

$$nl(f) = \min_{g \in A_n} d(f, g).$$

The nonlinearity of an n-variable Boolean function is bounded above by $2^{n-1} - 2^{n/2-1}$, and a function is said to be *bent* if it achieves this bound. It is known that the algebraic degree of a bent function is bounded above by $\frac{n}{2}$ [2, 6, 10].

The *r-order nonlinearity*, denoted by $nl_r(f)$, is its distance from the set of all n-variable functions of algebraic degrees at most r.

The r-th order Reed-Muller code of length 2^n is denoted by $RM(r, n)$. Its codewords can be presented by the set of n-variable Boolean functions of degree $\leq r$. The *covering radius* of $RM(r, n)$ is defined as

$$\max_{f \in B_n} d(f, RM(r, n)) = \max_{f \in B_n} nl_r(f).$$

We use $||$ to denote the concatenation. That is,

$$f_1||f_2 = (x_{n+1}+1)f_1 + x_{n+1}f_2,$$

where $f_1, f_2 \in B_n$.

3 Some observations

For $n = 6$, classification of Boolean functions under the affine group has been fully studied (see e.g. [8, 9]). It is known that there are exactly 205 affine equivalence classes modulo $RM(2,6)$. Investigating these affine equivalence classes, we have the following observations.

Observation 1. *Let $f \in B_6$ and $f = x_1x_2x_3 + x_1x_4x_5 + x_2x_4x_6 + x_3x_5x_6 + x_4x_5x_6 + g$, where g is any 6-variable Boolean function with $\deg(g) \leq 2$. Then $nl(f) \leq 22$.*

Observation 2. *Let $f \in B_6$. Then $nl_2(f) = 17$ if and only if there is a $g \in B_6$ with $\deg(g) \leq 2$ such that f is affine equivalent to $x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6 + x_1x_2x_3 + x_1x_4x_5 + x_2x_4x_6 + x_3x_5x_6 + x_4x_5x_6 + g$.*

In the following, $fun_1 = x_1x_2x_3 + x_1x_4x_5 + x_2x_4x_6 + x_3x_5x_6 + x_4x_5x_6$ and $fun_2 = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6 + fun_1$.

Observation 3. *Let $f \in B_6$. Then $nl_2(f) = 16$ if and only if there is a $g \in B_6$ with $\deg(g) \leq 2$ such that $f + g$ is affine equivalent to one of the following functions:*

(1) $fun_3 = x_1x_2x_6 + x_1x_3x_5 + x_2x_3x_4$;
(2) $fun_4 = x_1x_2x_3x_4 + x_1x_2x_6 + x_1x_4x_5 + x_2x_3x_5$;
(3) $fun_5 = x_1x_2x_3x_4 + x_1x_3x_5 + x_1x_4x_6 + x_2x_3x_5 + x_2x_3x_6 + x_2x_4x_5$;
(4) $fun_6 = x_1x_2x_3x_6 + x_1x_2x_4x_5 + x_1x_3x_5 + x_1x_4x_5 + x_1x_4x_6 + x_2x_3x_4$;
(5) $fun_7 = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5 + x_1x_3x_5 + x_1x_4x_6 + x_2x_3x_5 + x_2x_3x_6 + x_2x_4x_5$.

Observation 4. *Let $f \in B_6$. Then $nl_2(f) = 15$ if and only if there is a $g \in B_6$ with $\deg(g) \leq 2$ such that $f + g$ is affine equivalent to one of the functions $x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6 + fun_i$, where $3 \leq i \leq 7$.*

Definition 1. *Given $f \in B_n$, we denote by Fh_f the map from $\mathbb{Z}$ to the power set of B_n as follows:*

$$Fh_f(r) = \{g = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij}x_ix_j \mid a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_2 \text{ and } nl(f+g) = r\}.$$

We denote by NFh_f the function from $\mathbb{Z}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ whose value at r is the cardinality of the set $Fh_f(r)$.

Clearly, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} NFh_f(i) = 2^{n(n-1)/2}.$$

Moreover, if f_1 is affine equivalent to f_2, then $NFh_{f_1} = NFh_{f_2}$.

Observation 5. *We have*

(1) $NFh_{fun_3}(16) = 448$, $NFh_{fun_3}(26) = 0$ *and* $NFh_{fun_3}(28) = 64$*;*

(2) $NFh_{fun_4}(16) = 384$, $NFh_{fun_4}(18) = 1024$, $NFh_{fun_4}(20) = 9216$, $NFh_{fun_4}(22) = 14336$, $NFh_{fun_4}(24) = 6784$, $NFh_{fun_4}(26) = 10244$ *and* $NFh_{fun_4}(28) = 0$*;*

(3) $NFh_{fun_5}(i) = 0$, *for* $i \geq 26$*;*

(4) $NFh_{fun_6}(16) = 224$, $NFh_{fun_6}(18) = 1792$, $NFh_{fun_6}(20) = 8640$, $NFh_{fun_6}(22) = 14080$, $NFh_{fun_6}(24) = 7520$, $NFh_{fun_6}(26) = 512$ *and* $NFh_{fun_6}(28) = 0$*;*

(5) $NFh_{fun_7}(i) = 0$, *for* $i \geq 26$.

Observation 6. *We have* $NFh_{x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6+fun_i}(27) = 0$, *for* $4 \leq i \leq 7$. *Moreover,* $NFh_{fun_8}(15) = 112$ *and* $NFh_{fun_8}(27) = 64$, *where* $fun_8 = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6 + fun_3$.

Observation 7. *Let* $f \in B_6$ *and* $nl_2(f) = 14$. *Then* $NFh_f(r) = 0$, *for* $r > 26$. *Moreover, if* $NFh_f(26) > 0$, *then there is a* $g \in B_6$ *with* $\deg(g) \leq 2$ *such that* $f + g$ *is affine equivalent to one of the following functions:*

(1) $fun_9 = x_1x_2x_3x_4+x_1x_5x_6+x_2x_3x_6+x_2x_4x_5$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_9}(14) = 16$ *and* $NFh_{fun_9}(16) = 224$*;*

(2) $fun_{10} = x_1x_2x_3x_6+x_1x_2x_4x_5+x_1x_4x_5+x_1x_5x_6+x_2x_3x_5$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{10}}(14) = 32$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{10}}(16) = 224$*;*

(3) $fun_{11} = x_1x_2x_3x_6+x_1x_2x_4x_5+x_1x_5x_6+x_2x_4x_6+x_3x_4x_5$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{11}}(14) = 16$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{11}}(16) = 224$*;*

(4) $fun_{12} = x_1x_2x_5x_6+x_1x_3x_4x_6+x_2x_3x_4x_5+x_1x_2x_4+x_1x_3x_4+x_1x_3x_5+x_2x_3x_6$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{12}}(14) = 8$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{12}}(16) = 224$*;*

(5) $fun_{13} = x_1x_2x_5x_6+x_1x_3x_4x_6+x_2x_3x_4x_5+x_1x_3x_4+x_1x_4x_5+x_2x_3x_6$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{13}}(14) = 24$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{13}}(16) = 224$*;*

(6) $fun_{14} = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5+x_1x_2x_6+x_1x_3x_5+x_2x_3x_4$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{14}}(14) = 48$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{14}}(16) = 128$*;*

(7) $fun_{15} = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5+x_1x_2x_5+x_1x_4x_6+x_2x_3x_6$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{15}}(14) = 24$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{15}}(16) = 176$*;*

(8) $fun_{16} = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5 + x_1x_2x_3x_6 + x_1x_2x_6 + x_1x_3x_5 + x_2x_3x_4$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{16}}(14) = 64$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{16}}(16) = 160$*;*

(9) $fun_{17} = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5 + x_1x_2x_5x_6 + x_1x_3x_4x_6 + x_1x_2x_4 + x_1x_3x_5 + x_3x_4x_6$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{17}}(14) = 20$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{17}}(16) = 224$*;*

(10) $fun_{18} = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5 + x_1x_2x_5x_6 + x_1x_3x_4x_6 + x_1x_2x_4 + x_1x_3x_4 + x_1x_3x_5 + x_2x_5x_6 + x_3x_4x_6$*; moreover,* $NFh_{fun_{18}}(14) = 26$ *and* $NFh_{fun_{18}}(16) = 212$*;*

Remark 1. From the above observations, it is easy to see that the maximum possible second-order nonlinearity of a 6-variable bent function is 16, and there is no 6-variable bent function with the second-order nonlinearity 14. Moreover, the function $x_1x_3x_4 + x_1x_2x_5 + x_1x_6 + x_2x_4 + x_3x_4 + x_3x_5$ is a bent function with the second-order nonlinearity 16.

4 A theorem on the covering radius of the binary Reed-Muller code RM(2,7)

Lemma 1 ([1])**.** *Let* $f \in B_6$*. Then* $nl_2(f) = 18$ *if and only if there is a* $g \in B_6$ *with* $\deg(g) \leq 2$ *such that* f *is affine equivalent to* $fun_1 + g$*.*

Proposition 1. *Let* $f \in B_7$ *and* $f = f_1||f_2$*. If* $nl_2(f) > 40$*, then* $nl_2(f_1) \leq 16$ *and* $nl_2(f_2) \leq 16$*.*

Proof. Let $nl_2(f) > 40$. We divide the proof into the following two cases.

Case 1: $nl_2(f_1) = 18$ or $nl_2(f_2) = 18$.

We assume without loss of generality that $nl_2(f_1) = 18$. Then by Lemma 1, f_1 is affine equivalent to $fun_1 + g_0$, where $g_0 \in B_6$ and $\deg(g_0) \leq 2$. Therefore, by Observation 1, $nl(f_1+g_1) \leq 22$ for any $g_1 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_1) \leq 2$. Since $nl_2(f_2) \leq 18$, there exists a $g_2 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_2) \leq 2$ such that $d(f_2, g_2) \leq 18$. Since $nl(f_1+g_2) \leq 22$, there exists an $l \in B_6$ with $\deg(l) \leq 1$ such that $d(f_1, g_2 + l) \leq 22$. Let $g = (g_2 + l)||g_2 = g_2 + (x_7 + 1)l$. Then $nl_2(f) \leq d(f, g) \leq 40$. Hence, $nl_2(f_1) \leq 17$ and $nl_2(f_2) \leq 17$.

Case 2: $nl_2(f_1) = 17$ or $nl_2(f_2) = 17$.

We assume without loss of generality that $nl_2(f_1) = 17$. Then by Observation 2, f_1 is affine equivalent to fun_2+g_0, where $g_0 \in B_6$ and $\deg(g_0) \leq 2$. By Observation 1 and $d(fun_2, fun_1) = 1$, we have $nl(f_1 + g_1) \leq 23$ for any $g_1 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_1) \leq 2$. Since $nl_2(f_2) \leq 17$, there exists a $g_2 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_2) \leq 2$ such that $d(f_2, g_2) \leq 17$. Since $nl(f_1 + g_2) \leq 23$, there exists an $l \in B_6$ with $\deg(l) \leq 1$ such that $d(f_1, g_2 + l) \leq 23$. Let $g = (g_2 + l)||g_2 = g_2 + (x_7 + 1)l$. Then $nl_2(f) \leq d(f, g) \leq 40$, and the result follows. □

Lemma 2. *Let* $f \in B_n$ *and* $f = f_1||f_2$*. If*

$$NFh_{f_i}(n_2) > \sum_{k \geq n_1} NFh_{f_j}(k),$$

where $\{i,j\} = \{1,2\}$*, then* $nl_2(f) < n_1 + n_2$.

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that $i = 2$ and $j = 1$. Since

$$NFh_{f_2}(n_2) > \sum_{k \geq n_1} NFh_{f_1}(k),$$

there exists a homogeneous polynomial $g_0 \in B_{n-1}$ of degree 2 or 0 such that $nl(f_2 + g_0) = n_2$ and $nl(f_1 + g_0) < n_1$. That is, there are $l_1, l_2 \in B_{n-1}$ with $\deg(l_1) \leq 1$ and $\deg(l_2) \leq 1$ such that $d(f_1 + g_0 + l_1) < n_1$ and $d(f_2 + g_0 + l_2) = n_2$. Let $g = (g_0 + l_1)||(g_0 + l_2)$. Then $d(f, g) < n_1 + n_2$. □

Proposition 2. *Let* $f \in B_7$ *and* $f = f_1||f_2$*. Let* $nl_2(f_1) = nl_2(f_2) = 16$*. Then* $nl_2(f) \leq 42$*. Moreover, if* $nl_2(f) = 42$*, then there exist* $h_1, h_2 \in B_6$ *with* $\deg(h_1) \leq 2$ *and* $\deg(h_2) \leq 2$ *such that* $f_1 + h_1$ *is affine equivalent to* fun_{i_1} *and* $f_2 + h_2$ *is affine equivalent to* fun_{i_2}*, where* $i_1, i_2 \in \{4, 6\}$.

Proof. By Observation 3, there exist $g_1, g_2 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_1) \leq 2$ and $\deg(g_2) \leq 2$ such that f_1 is affine equivalent to $fun_i + g_1$ and f_2 is affine equivalent to $fun_j + g_2$, where $3 \leq i, j \leq 7$. By Observation 5,

$$NFh_{fun_j + g_2}(16) > NFh_{fun_i + g_1}(28).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2 and $nl_2(f)$ is even, we have $nl_2(f) \leq 42$.
Suppose $nl_2(f) = 42$. Then f_i ($i = 1$ or 2) cannot affine equivalent to $fun_j + g$ ($j = 5$ or 7) for any $g \in B_6$ of degree at most 2 (otherwise, by Observation 5, $nl_2(f) \leq 24 + 16 = 40$). Since

$$NFh_{fun_3}(26) + NFh_{fun_3}(28) < NFh_{fun_j}(16)$$

for $j \in \{3, 4, 6\}$, by Lemma 2, f_i ($i = 1$ or 2) cannot affine equivalent to $fun_3 + g$ for any $g \in B_6$ of degree at most 2, and the result follows. □

Proposition 3. *Let* $f \in B_7$ *and* $f = f_1||f_2$*. If* $nl_2(f_1) \leq 16$ *and* $nl_2(f_2) \leq 15$*, then* $nl_2(f) < 42$.

Proof. We divide the proof into the following four cases.

Case 1: $nl_2(f_1) = 16$ and $nl_2(f_2) = 15$.

Suppose $nl_2(f) \geq 42$. Then by Observations 3-6, there exist $g_1, g_2 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_1) \leq 2$ and $\deg(g_2) \leq 2$ such that f_1 is affine equivalent to $fun_3 + g_1$ and f_2 is affine equivalent to $fun_8 + g_2$ (since $16 + 25 = 15 + 26 < 42$). Since

$$NFh_{fun_8}(15) > NFh_{fun_3}(28)$$

and $nl_2(f)$ is odd, then by Lemma 2, $nl_2(f) \leq 41$.

Case 2: $nl_2(f_1) = 16$ and $nl_2(f_2) = 14$.

Suppose $nl_2(f) \geq 42$. Then by Observations 3 and 5, there exists a $g_1 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_1) \leq 2$ such that f_1 is affine equivalent to $fun_3 + g_1$ (since $14 + 26 < 42$). Moreover, we have $NFh_{f_2}(26) > 0$ (since $16 + 24 < 42$). Therefore, by Observations 7, there is a $g_2 \in B_6$ with $\deg(g_2) \leq 2$ such that $f_2 + g_2$ is affine equivalent to one of fun_i, where $9 \leq i \leq 18$. By Observations 5 and 7, it is easy to check that

$$NFh_{fun_i}(16) > NFh_{fun_3}(26) + NFh_{fun_3}(28),$$

for $9 \leq i \leq 18$. Hence, by Lemma 2, $nl_2(f) < 42$.

Case 3: $nl_2(f_1) = 15$ and $nl_2(f_2) = 15$.

By Observations 4 and 6, we have $nl_2(f) \leq 15 + 27 = 42$. Moreover, if $nl_2(f) = 42$, then there exist $h_1, h_2 \in B_6$ with $\deg(h_1) \leq 2$ and $\deg(h_2) \leq 2$ such that $f_1 + h_1$ and $f_2 + h_2$ are affine equivalent to fun_8. Since

$$NFh_{fun_8}(27) < NFh_{fun_8}(15),$$

then by Lemma 2, $nl_2(f) < 42$.

Case 4: $nl_2(f_1) < 15$ and $nl_2(f_2) < 15$.

If $nl_2(f_1) \leq 13$ or $nl_2(f_2) \leq 13$, then $nl_2(f) \leq 13 + 28 = 41$. If $nl_2(f_1) = nl_2(f_2) = 14$, then by Observations 7, we have $nl_2(f) \leq 14 + 26 = 40$. □

Remark 2. Since $f_1||f_2$ is affine equivalent to $f_2||f_1$, if $nl_2(f_1) \leq 15$ and $nl_2(f_2) \leq 16$, we also have $nl_2(f) < 42$.

Theorem 1. *Let $f \in B_7$. Then $nl_2(f) \leq 42$. Moreover, $nl_2(f) = 42$ if and only if the following conditions hold:*

(1) f is affine equivalent to

$$f_1||f_2 = fun_{i_1}||(fun_{i_2}(Ax + b) + g)$$

modulo $RM(2, 7)$, where $i_1, i_2 \in \{4, 6\}$, $A \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_2)$, $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $g \in B_6$ are of degree at most 2.

(2) Moreover, for $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$, we have $Fh_{f_i}(16) \subseteq Fh_{f_j}(26)$, $Fh_{f_i}(18) \subseteq Fh_{f_j}(24) \cup Fh_{f_j}(26)$ and $Fh_{f_i}(20) \subseteq Fh_{f_j}(22) \cup Fh_{f_j}(24) \cup Fh_{f_j}(26)$.

Proof. By Propositions 1-3, we have $nl_2(f) \leq 42$. Moreover, if $nl_2(f) = 42$, then there exist $h_1, h_2 \in B_6$ with $\deg(h_1) \leq 2$ and $\deg(h_2) \leq 2$ such that

$$f = (fun_{i_1}(A_1x + b_1) + h_1)||(fun_{i_2}(A_2x + b_2) + h_2),$$

where $i_1, i_2 \in \{4, 6\}$, $A_i \in GL_n(\mathbb{F}_2)$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, for $i = 1, 2$. Clearly, f is affine equivalent to $f_1||f_2 = fun_{i_1}||(fun_{i_2}(Ax + b) + g)$ modulo $RM(2, 7)$, where $A = A_2A_1^{-1}$, $b = A_2A_1^{-1}b_1 + b_2$ and $g = (h_1 + h_2)(A_1^{-1}x + A_1^{-1}b_1)$. For $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$, suppose there is a function $g_1 \in Fh_{f_i}(16) - Fh_{f_j}(26)$. Then $nl(f_i + g_1) = 16$ and $nl(f_j + g_1) \leq 24$. Hence, there exist affine functions l_1 and l_2 such that $d(f_i + g_1, l_1) = 16$ and $d(f_j + g_1, l_2) \leq 24$. Therefore, $nl_2(f) \leq 40$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $Fh_{f_i}(16) \subseteq Fh_{f_j}(26)$. Similarly, we have $Fh_{f_i}(18) \subseteq Fh_{f_j}(24) \cup Fh_{f_j}(26)$ and $Fh_{f_i}(20) \subseteq Fh_{f_j}(22) \cup Fh_{f_j}(24) \cup Fh_{f_j}(26)$.

Let $q \in B_7$ be of degree at most 2. Then it can be written as $q_1||q_2$, where $q_1, q_2 \in B_6$ have the same terms of degree 2. If the two conditions hold, then it is easy to check that $d(f, q) \geq 42$, and the result follows. □

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we prove that the covering radius of the binary Reed-Muller code $RM(2, 7)$ is at most 42. Moreover, we give a sufficient and necessary condition for Boolean functions of 7-variable to achieve the second-order nonlinearity 42.

References

[1] Y. Borissov, A. Braeken, S. Nikova and B. Preneel, "On the Covering Radii of Binary Reed-Muller Codes in the Set of Resilient Boolean Functions," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 51:3 (2005), 1182–1189.

[2] C. Carlet, "Boolean Functions for Cryptography and Error Correcting Codes," Chapter of the monography "Boolean Models and Methods in Mathematics, Computer Science, and Engineering", Cambridge University Press, pages 257–397, 2010. Available: http://www-roc.inria.fr/secret/Claude.Carlet/pubs.html.

[3] C. Carlet, "The complexity of Boolean functions from cryptographic viewpoint," 2006. Available: http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/dagstuhl/P6111.html

[4] C. Carlet and S. Mesnager, "Improving the upper bounds on the covering radii of binary ReedCMuller codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 53:1 (2007), 162–173.

[5] G. Cohen, I. Honkala, S. Litsyn and A. Lobstein, *Covering Codes*, North–Holland, 1997.

[6] T. W. Cusick, P. Stănică, *Cryptographic Boolean Functions and Applications*, Elsevier–Academic Press, 2009.

[7] R. Fourquet and C. Tavernier, "An improved list decoding algorithm for the second order Reed–Muller codes and its applications," *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* 49 (2008), 323–340.

[8] P. Langevin, "Classification of Boolean functions under the affine group," Online: http://langevin.univ-tln.fr/project/agl/agl.html

[9] J. A. Maiorana, "A classification of the cosets of the Reed–Muller code R(1,6)," *Math. Comp.* 57:195 (1991), 403–414.

[10] O. S. Rothaus, "On bent functions," *J. Comb. Theory – Ser. A* 20:3 (1976), 300–305.

[11] J. Schatz, "The second order Reed-Muller code of length 64 has covering radius 18," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 27:4 (1981), 529–530.